

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 are all the claims pending in the application.

In the Advisory Action dated May 25, 2005, the Examiner asserts that “Hase discloses surface treating the area around the locking hole 8 and stepped portion 9 to improve durability and prevent the locking the locking hole from being worn out.” (See page 2 of the Office Action).

However, claim 1 previously recited:

“an additional area is provided on the one of the first rotor and the second rotor having the engaging hole, such that the additional area encircles said surrounding area and does not include the surface treatment.” (Emphasis added).

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s comments do not address the surrounding area that does not include the surface treatment. Hase may disclose that “the area surrounding the stepped portion 9 and the locking hole 8 is processed by a quenching operation.” (See col. 5, lines 52-54 of Hase). However, Hase does not explicitly limit the area to which the treatment is applied, nor has the Examiner set forth any reasons why one would have been taught that the quenching operation in Hase is applied only to the stepped portion 9 and locking hole 8.

Moreover, in regard to the oxide-film forming treatment of claim 2, the Examiner cites two new references (U.S. Pat. No. 6,860,255 and 4,373,484). It is respectfully submitted that application of these references for the first time in the Advisory Action does not appear appropriate to support a previous rejection that did not include these references.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
Appln. No.: 10/781,771


Attorney Docket No.: Q79652

Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, claim 1 is further amended to emphasize the distinctions between the invention and the prior art. In particular, claim 1 is amended to recite that surface treatment does not extend past a lip of the hole. This feature is supported, as an example, in at least Figure 6 by the treated area "S2," in addition to other areas of the disclosure. The Examiner is requested to revisit the line of reasoning provided by Applicant in the Response filed on May 3, 2005, wherein it will be appreciated that Hase and the other cited references clearly do not teach or suggest the further defined treated region of claim 1 with the specificity required to place one in possession of the invention.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Daniel V. Williams
Registration No. 45,221

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 3, 2005